

S/N 10/800,530

Response to Office Action Dated 11/14/2005

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 1—21 are currently pending.

B) Claims 5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17 and 19—21 remain in their original form.

C) Claims 1—4, 6, 7, 10—13, 16 and 18 are currently amended.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

The §103 Rejections

Claims 1—5 and 7—21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,445,483, hereinafter "Takada" in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2001/0035999, hereinafter "Saito". In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Traversal of the §103 Rejections

Claim 1 recites a method of determining a start of a scan time in a laser scanning system utilizing a scanning reflector, comprising:

- directing a laser beam toward a facet of the scanning reflector so as to be reflected by the scanning reflector;
- returning the laser beam reflected from the scanning reflector toward the same facet of the scanning reflector for at least one additional reflection from the scanning reflector;
- detecting the laser beam reflected at least twice from the same facet of the scanning reflector; and
- controlling the start of the scan time of the laser scanning system, responsive to the detection of the laser beam.

The Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 11 to more particularly point out the claimed subject matter. In light of the claim amendments and the following

S/N 10/800,530

Response to Office Action Dated 11/14/2005

1 arguments, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of
2 Claims 1 and 11 be removed.

3 The Applicant observes that the Takada reference does not teach or suggest
4 detecting a laser beam reflected at least twice from the same facet of the scanning
5 reflector. This is clearly shown by the Applicant's disclosure, such as in Figs. 2—
6 4 and other locations. For example, in Fig. 2, the beams 112 and 132 reflect off
7 the same facet. In contrast, the Takada reference clearly teaches that the beam
8 reflects off a first surface 4, followed by a second surface 5, of the rotating
9 polygonal mirror 3. (See Takada, column 27 at lines 47—67.) By reflecting the
10 beam off the facet twice, the Applicant is able to increase detection resolution (see
11 Applicant's disclosure at page 5, lines 20—25). Accordingly, the Applicant
12 submits that the Takada reference is deficient to sustain the Section 103 rejection,
13 in view of the claim amendment.

14 The Applicant submits that the Saito reference fails to remedy the
15 deficiency of Takada. In particular, Takada fails to teach or suggest detecting a
16 laser beam reflected at least twice from the same facet of the scanning reflector.
17 Referring to Saito, particularly at Fig. 1, it is clear that Saito does not disclose
18 reflecting a laser beam off the same facet twice. Accordingly, Saito fails to
19 remedy the deficiency of Takada. Thus, neither reference teaches or suggests
20 detecting a laser beam reflected at least twice from the same facet of the scanning
21 reflector. In view of this deficiency and the claim amendments, the Applicant
22 respectfully requests that the Patent Office remove the Section 103 rejection from
23 Claim 1.

S/N 10/800,530

Response to Office Action Dated 11/14/2005

1 **Claim 2** recites a method according to claim 1, wherein the laser beam
2 **directed and returned to the facet of the scanning reflector is separate from a**
3 **modulated data beam.**

4 The Applicant has amended Claim 2 to more particularly point out the
5 claimed subject matter. In particular, the Applicant has indicted that the laser
6 beam directed and returned to the facet of the scanning reflector is separate from a
7 modulated data beam. This is clearly shown by the Applicant's specification, e.g.
8 at Fig. 2, where 122 is separate from 112/132. Referring to the Takada reference,
9 e.g. at Fig. 1, it can be seen that the laser beam directed toward the facet of the
10 scanning reflector is combined with the modulated beam. These two beams only
11 separate *after* leaving device 12. Accordingly, the elements recited by Claim 2, as
12 amended, are not taught or suggested by Takada or Saito references, and the
13 Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of this claim be
14 removed.

15 **Claim 3** recites a method according to claim 2, wherein the modulated
16 data beam reflects only once on the facet of the scanning reflector.

17
18 The Applicant has amended Claim 3 to more particularly point out the
19 claimed subject matter. In particular, the Applicant has indicted that the
20 modulated data beam reflects only once on the facet of the scanning reflector. For
21 example, Fig. 2 of the Applicant's specification shows 122 reflecting only once.
22 Referring to the Takada reference, e.g. at Fig. 1, it can be seen that the modulated
23 laser beam reflects twice on the scanning reflector. In Takada, the two beams (the
24 modulated beam which contacts 14 and the signal beam which contacts the sensor)
25

S/N 10/800,530

Response to Office Action Dated 11/14/2005

1 are both combined. (Refer to Takada at column 12, lines 24—33, wherein Takada
2 explains how the beam reflects off two different facets, and then splits at 12 to be
3 a modulated beam and a sync beam.) Accordingly, the elements recited by Claim
4 3, as amended, are not taught or suggested by Takada or Saito references, and the
5 Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of this claim be
6 removed.

7
8 **Claim 4 recites a method according to claim 2, wherein a modulated data**
9 **beam reflects once off the facet of the scanning reflector from which the laser**
10 **beam reflected twice.**

11 The Applicant has amended Claim 4 to more particularly point out the
12 claimed subject matter. In particular, the Applicant has indicated that a modulated
13 data beam reflects once off the facet of the scanning reflector from which the
14 synchronizing laser beam reflected twice. This feature is clearly seen in Fig. 2 and
15 other locations of the Applicant's specification. Thus, the Applicant gains the
16 benefit of reflecting the synchronizing beam off the facet twice, for extra detection
17 resolution, without the drawbacks of reflecting the modulate beam off the
18 scanning reflector twice. Referring to the Takada reference, e.g. at Fig. 1, it can
19 be seen that the combined modulated and sync laser beams reflects twice on the
20 scanning reflector. (Again, refer to Takada at column 12, lines 24—33, wherein
21 Takada explains how the beam reflects off two different facets, and this splits at
22 12 to be a modulated beam and a sync beam.) Accordingly, the elements recited
23 by Claim 4, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the Takada and Saito
24 references, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection
25 of this claim be removed.

S/N 10/800,530

Response to Office Action Dated 11/14/2005

1 **Claims 2—10** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable as depending from
2 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
3 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are neither disclosed
4 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one
5 another.

6 **Claim 11** recites a laser scanning system, comprising:

- 7 • a laser beam source modulated by data;
- 8 • a scanning reflector;
- 9 • at least one reflector positioned to receive light from the source that
10 has been reflected from a facet of the scanning reflector **back**
11 **toward the same facet of the scanning reflector;**
- 12 • a detector adapted to detect the laser beam after reflecting at least
13 twice **from the same facet of the scanning reflector;** and
- 14 • a controller adapted to control timing of the data, including a start of
15 a scan of the scanning system, responsive to detection of light by the
16 detector.

17 The Applicant observes Claim 11 was rejected using the same argument as
18 Claim 1, and has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Accordingly, the
19 Applicant submits that Claim 11 is allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 1
20 is allowable, and the argument set forth with respect to Claim 1 is incorporated
21 herein by reference.

22 **Claims 12—17** depend from Claim 11 and are allowable as depending
23 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own
24 recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 11, are neither
25 disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination
with one another. For example, several of these claims are allowable for at least
the reasons discussed with respect to Claims 2—4.

S/N 10/800,530

Response to Office Action Dated 11/14/2005

1 **Claim 18** recites a laser scanning system, comprising:

- 2 • a laser beam source;
- 3 • a scanning reflector;
- 4 • a detector adapted to detect light reflected at least twice from a
- 5 **same facet** of the scanning reflector; and
- 6 • a controller adapted to control the timing of the scanning system,
- 7 including a start of scan of the scanning system, responsive to the
- 8 detection of light by the detector;
- 9 • **wherein a modulated data beam created by the laser beam**
- 10 **source reflects only once on the facet of the scanning reflector.**

11 The Applicant observes Claim 18 was rejected using the same argument as

12 Claim 1, and has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Additionally, as

13 seen in the arguments above, Takada and Saito fail to teach or suggest that a

14 modulated beam reflects only once, while the sync beam reflects twice.

15 Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 18 is allowable for at least the

16 reasons that Claim 1 is allowable, and the argument set forth with respect to Claim

17 1 is incorporated herein by reference.

18 **Claims 19—21** depend from Claim 18 and are allowable as depending

19 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own

20 recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 18, are neither

21 disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination

22 with one another.

23 **Conclusion**

24 The arguments presented above are intended to present the Applicant's

25 position clearly, but should not be considered exhaustive. Accordingly, the

Applicant reserves the right to present additional arguments to clarify the

Applicant's position further. Moreover, the Applicant reserves the right to

S/N 10/800,530

Response to Office Action Dated 11/14/2005

1 challenge the status as prior art of one or more documents cited in the Office
2 Action.

3 The Applicant submits that the claims as presented are in condition for
4 allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of
5 Allowability be issued. If the Patent Office's next anticipated action is not the
6 issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the
7 undersigned attorney be contacted to schedule an interview.

8
9
10 Respectfully Submitted,

11
12 Dated: 13 April 2006

13 By: 

14 David S. Thompson
15 Reg. No. 37,954
16 Attorney for Applicant

17 LEE & HAYES PLLC
18 Suite 500
19 421 W. Riverside Avenue
20 Spokane, Washington 99201
21 Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
22 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
23
24
25